DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 284 JC 890 008

TITLE	Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1987-88. A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation. Commission Report 88-30.
INSTITUTION	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	Sep 88
NOTE	29p.; For the fall 1987 report, see ED 291 309.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1020 Twelfth St., Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95815-3985.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Rank (Professional); Annual Reports; *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; Contract Salaries; Full Time Faculty; Higher Education; Part Time Faculty; *Retirement Benefits; State Colleges; State Surveys; *Teacher Employment Benefits; Teacher Recruitment; Teacher Retirement; *Teacher Salaries; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

Data are presented on faculty and administrator salaries in the California community colleges, with comparative figures for the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU). Section 1 presents UC and CSU comparison group average salaries for 1982-83 and 1987-88, including information on compound rates of interest, projected salaries and staffing patterns for 1988-89, and projected parity comparisons. Section 2 presents an overview of both full-time and part-time faculty salaries in the community colleges, estimating the mean salary of regular and contract faculty at $40,046. This section also discusses the implications of the community college data with respect to teacher recruitment, disparity in salaries among districts, and the use of part-time faculty. Finally, section 3 presents the salaries of 18 campus-based administrative positions and salaries of central office administrative positions (11 at UC; 9 at CSU). (AJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302284

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON ACADEMIC SALARIES, 1987-88

A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Testa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

IC 890 008

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814-3985

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY

The faculty salary methodology of the California Postsecondary Education Commission requires the University of California and the California State University to Update the information presented in the Commission's annual report on facult salaries when any comparison institution does not submit complete data for the current academic year. This year, three of the State University comparison institution fell into that category, and Part One of this report on pages 1-5 presents updated data for two of these three missing State University comparison institutions, resulting in a slight increase in the State University's parity figure from 4.67 to 4.83. Since the University of California received data from all its comparison institutions, there is no change in its parity figure of 2.98 percent.

The remaining two parts of the report respond to Supplemental Language to the 1979 and 1981 Budget Acts, which direct the Commission to prepare annual reports on California Community College faculty salaries, and on the salaries of University and State University administrators.

Part Two on pages 7-17 thus presents an overview of faculty salaries in the Community Colleges, and it estimates the mean salary of regular and contract faculty at $40,046.

Part Three on pages 19-22 shows the salaries of 18 campus-based positions and between nine and eleven central office administrative positions at the University and State University, with comparison institution data for the campus-based positions.

This report is designed to provide only descriptive data, and consequently it offers neither conclusions nor recommendations. On pages 15-17, however, it offers several policy implications from the data for the hiring and compensation of both Community College full-time and part-time faculty.

The Commission adopted this report at its meeting on September 19, 1988 on recommendation of its Policy Development Committee. Additional copies of the report may be obtained from the Library of the Commission at (916) 322-8031. Questions about the substance of the report may be directed to Murray J. Haberman of the Commission staff at (916)322-8001.

COMMISSION REPORT 88-30
PUBLISHED SEPTEMBER 1988

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 88-30 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

Contents

Executive Summary 1

1. Update on Faculty Salary Parity Figures 3
   - University of California Comparisons 3
   - California State University Comparisons 3

2. Community College Faculty Salaries 7
   - Introduction 7
   - Average Salaries 7
   - Part-Time Faculty and Full-Time Faculty With Overload Assignments 9
   - Summary 12
   - Implications of the Community College Data 15

3. Selected Administrators' Salaries in Universities 19
   - Introduction 19
   - University of California 19
   - The California State University 19

Appendix: Letter from Kenneth B. O'Brien to Gerald Hayward, August 9, 1979 23

References 25

Displays

1. University of California Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1982-83 and 1987-88, Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1988-89, Projected Parity Comparisons, and Projected 1988-89 Staffing Patterns 4

2. California State University Faculty Salary Parity Calculations, 1988-89 (Comparison Institution Average Salaries, 1982-83 and 1987-88; Five-Year Compound Rates of Increase; Comparison Institution 1988-89 Projected Salaries; State University 1987-88 Average Salaries; 1988-89 Projected Percentage Salary Deficiency; 1987-88 Staffing Patterns) 5

3. Mean Salaries in the California Community Colleges, 1987-88 8

4. The Ten Highest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1979 to Fall 1987 10

5. The Ten Lowest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1979 to Fall 1987 11

6. Analysis of the Mean Salaries Paid by the Highest and Lowest Paying Community College Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1979 to Fall 1987 12

7. Annualized Cost of Living Adjustments Granted to Regular and Contract California Community College Faculty, By District, 1985-86 to 1987-88 13

8. Sonoma County Junior College District Faculty Salary Schedule, 1987-88 15

9. Analysis of the Mean Dollars per Weekly Faculty Contact Hour (WFCH) Paid to Full-Time Faculty, Part-Time Faculty, and Full-Time Faculty Teaching Overload Assignments in the California Community Colleges, Fall 1981 to Fall 1987 16

10. Salaries of Campus-Based Administrators at the University of California and Its Eight Comparison Universities, 1987-88 20

11. Administrative Salary Data for the California State University and Its Twenty Comparison Universities, 1987-88 21

12. Salaries of Central-Office Administrators at the University of California and the California State University, 1987-88 22

Executive Summary

THIS report consists of three independent sections.

1. Update on faculty salary parity figures

Senate Concurrent Resolution 51 of 1965 directed the Coordinating Council for Higher Education -- the predecessor of the California Postsecondary Education Commission -- to prepare annual reports in cooperation with the University of California and the California State University on their faculty salaries in comparison with groups of similar institutions.

Since its creation in 1974, the Postsecondary Education Commission has continued this series of reports, and the methodology that it uses to complete them requires that the University and the State University update the information presented in the reports when any of their comparison institutions do not submit complete faculty salary data for the current academic year.

This year, all of the University's eight comparison institutions submitted the needed data, but only 17 of the State University's 20 comparison institutions did so. Information has now been received from two of the three non-reporting institutions, which increases the parity figure for the State University by 0.16 percentage point -- from 4.67 up to 4.83 percent.

2. Community College faculty salaries

Part Two of the report responds to Supplemental Language to the 1979 Budget Act, which directed the Commission to prepare annual reports on the salaries of California Community Colleges' faculty members. It presents an overview of those salaries and estimates the mean salary of regular and contract faculty at $40,046. It indicates that the difference in mean salaries between the ten highest-paying districts and the ten lowest-paying of all 70 districts in the State is at least 25 percent. Finally, it shows that on a statewide basis, full-time faculty earn about twice as much per weekly faculty contact hour as part-time faculty.

3. Selected administrators' salaries in universities

Part Three responds to Supplemental Language in the 1981 Budget Act, which instructed the Commission to report annually on the salaries of University and State University administrators. It shows the salaries of 18 campus-based and between 9 and 11 central office administrative positions at the University and State University, with comparison data for the campus-based positions.

Part Three shows that, for several reasons, campus-based administrative salaries at the University of California lag behind the mean salaries reported by its comparisons for all 18 administrative positions surveyed for this report, with the differences ranging from 0.9 percent for directors of personnel to 35.4 percent for directors of information systems. At the State University, campus administrators in five positions receive between 2.4 and 19.5 percent more than the mean of their counterparts at comparsion institutions, while campus administrators in 13 other positions receive between 0.4 and 18.1 percent less. Its campus presidents receive 16.2 percent less than their counterparts in the State University's comparison institutions.

1 *Update on Faculty Salary Parity Figures*

DURING the 1988-89 budget cycle, the California Postsecondary Education Commission used for the third time its revised methodology for comparing faculty salaries at California's two public universities with their groups of similar institutions. It undertook a comprehensive examination of the raw data supplied to both the University of California and the California State University by their comparison institutions, and it published the results of its analysis in *Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1988-89* (March 1988). Under the methodology, which the Commission revised in 1985, both the University and the State University are obligated to update the information presented in the *Faculty Salaries* report when any comparison institution does not submit complete data in the current year in time for the report.

University of California comparisons

Because all eight of the University's comparison institutions had reported their salary data in time for the March report, the University's faculty salary increase needed in 1988-89 for parity with the mean salary of the eight remains 2.98 percent -- the same figure that the Commission indicated to the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst last December and that appeared on page 17 of the March report, from which Display 1 on page 4 is reproduced.

California State University comparisons

Three of the State University's 20 comparison universities submitted incomplete data for use in the March report, but a formula developed by the Commission's Advisory Committee on the Faculty Salary Methodology provided for their inclusion in the derivation of the State University's parity percentage, which indicated that faculty salaries in the State University would have to be increased by 4.67 percent in 1988-89 to equal the mean salary paid by its comparison institutions.

Since then, two of the three institutions have updated their payroll data and supplied them in the required format to the Office of the Chancellor of the State University, which in turn has forwarded those data to Commission staff. Both of these institutions reported slightly higher salaries than projected by formula, and the net effect of these increases is to raise the figure needed by the State University for parity by 0.16 percentage points. Accordingly, the 4.67 percent figure adopted by the Commission in March should be increased to 4.83 percent. The corresponding updated figures are shown in Display 2 on page 5.

DISPLAY 1 *University of California Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1982-83 and 1987-88, Compound Rates of Increase, Projected Comparison Group Average Salaries, 1988-89, Projected Parity Comparisons, and Projected 1988-89 Staffing Patterns*

Academic Rank	Comparison Group Average Salaries 1982-83	Comparison Group Average Salaries 1987-88	Compound Rate of Increase	Comparison Group Projected Salaries 1988-89
Professor	$46,811	$63,719	6.361%	$67,772
Associate Professor	$31,450	$43,394	6.651%	$46,280
Assistant Professor	$25,461	$35,573	6.918%	$38,034

Academic Rank	University of California Actual Average Salaries 1987-88	Comparison Group Average Salaries		Percentage Increase Required in University of California Average Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution Average	
		Actual 1987-88	Projected 1988-89	Actual 1987-88	Projected 1988-89
Professor	$65,881	$63,719	$67,772	-3.28%	2.87%
Associate Professor	$43,574	$43,394	$46,280	-0.41%	6.21%
Assistant Professor	$38,424	$35,573	$38,034	-7.42%	-1.01%
All Ranks Averages (UC Staffing)	$57,541	$55,664	$59,258	-3.26%	2.98%

Institutional Budget Year Staffing Pattern (Full Time Equivalent)	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total
University of California	3,425	1,009	757	5,191
Comparison Institutions	4,232.5	1,858.74	1,815.33	7,906.57

Source: Reproduced from California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1988, Display 2, p. 7.

DISPLAY 2 *California State University Faculty Salary Parity Calculations, 1988-89 (Comparison Institution Average Salaries, 1982-83 and 1987-88; Five-Year Compound Rates of Increase; Comparison Institution 1988-89 Projected Salaries; State University 1987-88 Average Salaries; 1988-89 Projected Percentage Salary Deficiency; 1987-88 Staffing Patterns)*

Academic Rank	Comparison Group Weighted by Total 1982-83	Average Salaries Faculty at Each Rank 1987-88	Five-Year Percentage Rate of Change	Comparison Group Projected Salaries 1988-89
Professor	$39,679	$53,363	6.105%	$56,621
Associate Professor	$29,673	$39,454	5.863%	$41,768
Assistant Professor	$23,865	$32,803	6.569%	$34,957
Instructor	$18,769	$25,070	5.960%	$26,564

Academic Rank	California State University Average Salaries 1987-88	Comparison Group Average Salaries 1987-88	Comparison Group Average Salaries 1988-89	Percentage Increase Required in CSU Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution Average 1987-88	Percentage Increase Required in CSU Salaries to Equal the Comparison Institution Average 1988-89
Professor	$52,573	$53,363	$56,621	1.50%	7.70%
Associate Professor	$40,782	$39,454	$41,768	-3.26%	2.42%
Assistant Professor	$32,888	$32,803	$34,957	-0.26%	6.29%
Instructor	$28,324	$25,070	$26,564	-11.49%	-6.21%
All Ranks Averages: Weighted by Staffing	$47,140	$47,303	$50,189	0.35%	6.47%
Weighted by Comparison Institution Staffing	$42,525	$42,193	$44,772	-0.78%	5.28%
Mean All Ranks Average and Gross Percentage Amount*	$44,833	$44,748	$47,481	-0.19%	5.91%
Adjustments:					
Turnover and Promotions			-90		0.20%
Effect of Law Faculty			-90		0.20%
Merit Award Adjustment			-305		0.68%
Net Parity Salary and Percent			$46,996		4.83%

Institutional Staffing Patterns:	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Total
The California State University	7,409	2,468	1,491	176	11,544
Comparison Institutions	4,218	4,386	3,043	381	12,028

Source: Office of the Chancellor, The California State University.

5/6

2 *Community College Faculty Salaries*

Introduction

In February 1979, the Legislative Analyst recommended in the *Analysis of the Budget Bill, 1979-80*, that the Commission include information on California Community College faculty salaries in its annual faculty salary reports. Responding to this recommendation, the Commission presented data on Community College faculty salaries for the 1977-78 fiscal year in its report, *Faculty Salaries in California Public Higher Education, 1979-80*, of April 1979, but it was unable to include data for 1978-79 (the then current year) because the Chancellor's Office had abandoned such data collection as part of the cutbacks resulting from the passage of Proposition 13 in June 1978.

Subsequently, Commission staff proposed that the submission of Community College faculty salary data be formalized, and for that purpose the Legislature appropriated $15,000 to the Chancellor's Office for the 1979-80 fiscal year. In August 1979, Commission staff outlined for the Chancellor the specific information desired (Appendix, pp. 21-22) and asked the Chancellor's staff to submit 1978-79 data by November 1, 1979, and data for subsequent fiscal years by March 1 of the year involved.

In 1981-82, the Chancellor's Office initiated the "Staff Data File" -- a computerized data collection system that is now in its seventh year of operation and that has provided comprehensive reports for the past five years.

During these past five years, the Chancellor's Office has produced comprehensive and accurate reports that contain information on average salaries and salary ranges; cost-of-living adjustments; teaching loads; numbers of full- and part-time faculty; age, sex, and ethnicity; number of new hires, promotions, and leaves; and qualifications for various salary categories.

Although substantially improved from prior years, two problems remain. The first relates to the submission of data that are incomplete due primarily to extended collective bargaining negotiations. When negotiations extend into the spring of the current academic year, and cost-of-living adjustments are accordingly allocated retroactively, there is seldom sufficient time to include the increases in the mean salary figures reported. The result is that many of the mean salaries reported are inaccurate. In addition, cost-of-living adjustments were not reported at all for 16 of the system's 70 districts.

The second problem is that complete salary adjustments are not always reported. In 1986-87, for example, one-time "off-schedule" adjustments were granted to faculty in six districts. In addition, the Chancellor's Office chose to average all increases granted after July 1 over the entire year. Thus, a 5 percent increase granted on January 1 is only counted as a 2.5 percent increase, even though the effect is to lift the entire salary schedule by 5 percent by the end of the fiscal year. These problems are discussed further in the next section.

Average salaries

Display 3 on page 8 shows 1987-88 mean salaries as reported by 68 of the 70 districts, the Lassen and Victor Valley Community College Districts not reporting. The first footnote in that display indicates that 16 districts did not report cost-of-living increases for 1987-88 and consequently could not incorporate such increases into their mean salary figures. Consequently, the salaries reported more nearly approximate 1986-87 salaries for those districts. The second footnote includes districts where salary negotiations were complete, but which did not have sufficient time to incorporate those increases into their mean salary figures.

In all, Display 3 indicates that accurate current-year data are available for only 27 districts -- 38.6 percent of the 70 possible -- and the faculty employed by those districts represent 37.9 percent of the systemwide total. Accordingly, it is probable that the actual mean salary for the system is higher than $40,046 reported. To provide an estimate of actual

DISPLAY 3 Mean Salaries in the California Community Colleges, 1987-88

District	Mean Salary	District	Mean Salary
Allan Hancock	$36,658	Pasadena Area[1]	$39,812
Antelope Valley[1]	36,659	Peralta[1]	36,275
Barstow[1]	37,159	Rancho Santiago[2]	39,969
Butte[2]	39,054	Redwoods	39,564
Cabrillo[2]	33,769	Rio Hondo	43,602
Cerritos[2]	44,097	Riverside	40,585
Chaffey[2]	36,538	Saddleback	46,335
Citrus[2]	42,215	San Bernardino[1]	39,346
Coachella Valley[2]	37,898	San Diego[1]	34,863
Coast[2]	40,133	San Diego Adult[1]	25,656
Compton	34,475	San Francisco Centers[1]	34,221
Contra Costa[1]	43,979	San Francisco[1]	39,977
El Camino[2]	42,451	San Joaquin Delta	45,923
Foothill/DeAnza	43,465	San Jose	40,938
Fremont-Newark	41,197	San Luis Obispo	40,098
Gavilan	37,029	San Mateo[2]	42,621
Glendale[2]	39,093	Santa Barbara[2]	37,764
Grossmont[1]	37,582	Santa Clarita	40,597
Hartnell[2]	38,517	Santa Monica[2]	41,678
Imperial	32,642	Sequoias[2]	40,500
Kern[2]	36,669	Shasta-Tehama-Trinity[2]	38,093
Lake Tahoe	39,037	Sierra[2]	38,281
Lassen	N/A	Siskiyou[1]	34,843
Long Beach	42,403	Solano County[2]	39,563
Los Angeles	41,373	Sonoma County	41,376
Los Rios	38,656	South County[2]	40,586
Marin[2]	45,013	Southwestern	42,764
Mendocino	36,460	State Center[1]	39,855
Merced	38,280	Ventura County[1]	40,035
Mira Costa	40,836	Victor Valley[1]	N/A
Monterey Peninsula[2]	36,703	West Hills[2]	36,346
Mount San Antonio[2]	42,685	West Kern[1]	44,201
Mount San Jacinto	37,646	West Valley	41,479
Napa[2]	33,581	Yosemite[1]	40,722
North Orange[1]	40,531	Yuba[2]	38,123
Palo Verde[2]	34,505		
Palomar	40,138	Total	$40,046[3]

1. District was still in the process of salary negotiations for 1987-88 at the time mean salary data were reported. Consequently, the salaries reported more closely approximates the 1986-87 mean.

2. Although salary negotiations were complete as of the Chancellor's Office deadline for reporting data, mean salary data do not reflect the 1987-88 cost-of-living adjustment. Consequently, the salaries reported may more closely approximate the 1986-87 mean.

3. Lassen and Victor Valley Community College Districts did not report data to the Chancellor's Office in time for this report.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Ofice.

salaries, the mean salaries of the 43 nonreporting districts (excluding Lassen and Victor Valley, which reported no data) were incremented by 5 percent, a procedure that resulted in a systemwide mean salary of $40,860. There is no way of knowing how accurate that figure may be, but it is probably closer to reality than the $40,046 contained in the Chancellor's Office report.

Displays 4 and 5 on pages 10 and 11 show mean salaries as reported in the Staff Data File for regular and contract faculty in the ten highest- and ten lowest-paying districts for selected years between Fall 1979 and Fall 1987, and the systemwide means for each of those years. In each case, those districts reporting incomplete mean salary data are indicated. Display 6 on page 12 shows mean salaries for those districts as a group, the percentage difference between them, and the total number of faculty.

Display 7 on page 13 provides cost-of-living adjustment data, by district, for the current and previous two years, weighted by the size of faculty in each district. In each case, off-schedule payments and mid-year adjustments are reflected, inclusions that increase the systemwide average from the 4.01 percent reported by the Chancellor's Office for 1986-87 to 4.58 percent, and the 3.29 percent reported for 1987-88 to 5.04 percent.

From Display 4 it can be seen that those districts with higher salaries tend to be the larger districts, and also tend to be those reporting complete data. The first of these points is actually more pronounced since the evening program at San Diego was included in the overall districtwide average. Faculty working in that program tend to be paid about 26 percent less than regular faculty at the main campus, and their inclusion consequently reduces the districtwide average. Were they to be excluded, the differences between the highest- and lowest-paying districts, as shown in Displays 4 and 5, would be even greater, thus highlighting the size factor even more. Either way, the difference in mean salaries between the highest-paying districts and the lowest-paying districts is about 28 percent. The probability, however -- with seven of the ten lowest paying but only five of the ten highest-paying districts reporting incomplete data -- is that the true difference between the two groups is closer to 25 percent. In 1987-88, the highest-paying district was Saddleback with a mean of $46,335. The lowest was Imperial at $32,642, a difference of 41.9 percent -- although it should be noted that Imperial's faculty had reopened negotiations on their existing contract with their district's administration. Among those districts that had finalized negotiations, the lowest paying was the Compton District at $34,475, a figure 34.4 percent lower than Saddleback's.

The Chancellor's Office also provided salary schedules for each of the 70 districts in the Community College system. These generally provide a number of salary categories or classes through which a faculty member can advance depending on educational qualifications, and another series of steps that provide salary increases based on longevity. A typical schedule is shown in Display 8 on page 14. As with mean salaries, these schedules vary greatly from district to district, some offering only one salary classification based on educational achievement, while others offer as many as nine. In addition, some districts offer as few as 12 anniversary increments, while others offer 30 or more. In some cases, additional stipends are offered for doctoral degree holders, department chairmen, and others with special qualifications or responsibilities.

Part-time faculty and full-time faculty with overload assignments

For many years, the Community Colleges have employed a large number of part-time or temporary faculty, and most districts have also permitted full-time regular and contract faculty to work additional hours or overloads. Display 9 on page 15 shows several comparisons between full-time, part-time, and overload faculty between Fall 1981 and Fall 1987. For example, it shows the number of full-time faculty with and without overload assignments compared to the number of part-time faculty. It also shows workload in terms of weekly faculty contact hours (WFCH) -- the actual number of hours faculty spend in classrooms. Comparing these two, it can be seen that, while part-time faculty outnumber full-time faculty by almost a two-to-one margin, they teach 34.3 percent of these contact hours. Regular and contract faculty teach 59.3 percent on regular assignments, with those teaching overloads accounting for the remaining 6.4 percent. Regular and contract faculty on regular assignments are averaging 15.0 weekly faculty contact hours in 1987-88, while

DISPLAY 4 The Ten Highest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1979 to Fall 1987

	Ten Highest Paying Districts Each Year and Number of Reporting Districts					
Year:	1979	1981	1983	1985	1986	1987
Number of Districts:	70	69	70	70	69	68
Saddleback	$27,732	$35,071	$37,697	$42,083	$41,815	$46,335
San Joaquin Delta	27,715	36,275	35,579	41,562	44,029	45,923
Marin[1]						45,013
West Kern[1]			36,786	38,975	41,934	44,201
Cerritos[1]		33,153	34,900	39,258	41,746	44,097
Contra Costa[1]	28,239	32,813		39,047	43,998	43,979
Rio Hondo					40,481	43,602
Foothill/DeAnza	27,919	33,234		41,547	41,711	43,466
Southwestern						42,764
Mt. San Antonio[1]			34,942	38,417	40,632	42,685
Long Beach	27,850	33,404	34,754	39,547	42,326	
Santa Monica		32,033		39,809	41,334	
Peralta[1]	27,754					
San Jose	28,125		35,053			
Coast[1]	27,801	33,245	35,015			
North Orange[1]	27,755	32,070				
Coachella Valley[1]	27,640			39,211		
Sequoias[1]		32,116	38,750			
El Camino[1]			37,110			
Statewide Mean Salary[2]	**$26,270**	**$30,156**	**$32,704**	**$36,203**	**$38,005**	**$40,046**

1. Annualized 1987-88 cost-of-living adjustment not included in the mean salary data reported.
2. Weighted by total faculty in each district.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

part-time faculty are averaging 5.3 hours, with those teaching any overload averaging 4.7. About 38 percent of full-time regular and contract faculty members teach some overload. All of these averages have been relatively constant for the seven-year period shown in Display 9.

Compensation comparisons between full-time and part-time faculty are difficult, since full-time faculty have responsibilities other than classroom teaching, while part-time faculty generally do not. Full-time faculty also spend time in counseling, advising, committee work, office hours, and community service. Preparation for classroom teaching, however, necessarily occupies a considerable amount of time for both full-time and part-time faculty. The exact proportion of total workload devoted to activities not directly related to classroom teaching is not known, but an assumption used recently by the Chancellor's Office is that 75 percent is instructionally related (teaching and preparation) with 25 percent devoted

DISPLAY 5 The Ten Lowest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1979 to Fall 1987

	Ten Lowest Paying Districts Each Year and Number of Reporting Districts					
Year:	1979	1981	1983	1985	1986	1987
Number of Districts:	70	69	70	70	69	68
Imperial				$30,900	$32,090	$32,642
San Diego[1,2]	$22,707	$26,573	$27,829	31,174	30,983	33,102
Napa[1]	23,204		28,245	31,442	33,099	33,581
Cabrillo[1]			28,631	32,264	32,960	33,768
Compton	23,924	25,809	29,091	30,632	30,929	34,475
Palo Verde[1]	21,539	25,369		30,930		34,505
Siskiyou[1]			28,326			34,843
Peralta[1]		26,060	29,213			36,275
West Hills[1]						36,346
Mendocino						36,460
Lassen		27,416	29,098	32,308	32,856	
Allan Hancock[1]		27,469	28,401		33,962	
Victor Valley[1]	23,743			31,967	34,061	
Monterey Peninsula[1]					34,385	
Santa Barbara[1]					34,794	
Gavilan	24,011	26,555		32,234		
Antelope Valley[1]	22,028	26,440	29,185	32,341		
Lake Tahoe	23,692		28,429			
Rio Hondo	23,200					
West Kern[1]	23,470					
San Francisco[1,3]		27,460				
Barstow[1]		26,476				
Statewide Mean Salary[4]	**$26,270**	**$30,156**	**$32,704**	**$36,203**	**$38,005**	**$40,046**

1. Annualized 1987-88 cost-of-living adjustment not included in the mean salary data reported.
2. Regular and evening programs combined.
3. Regular and centers programs combined.
4. Weighted by total faculty in each district.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

to other campus activities (Chancellor's Office, 1987, p. 7). With this factor, although not a precise measure, it is possible to present a general comparison.

The Chancellor's Office publishes hourly rates for part-time faculty and full-time faculty with overload assignments, and these systemwide data are also shown in Item 5 in Display 9. This shows overload faculty are currently paid about 17 percent more than part-time faculty.

Items 7 and 8 in Display 9 compare the estimate of compensation per weekly faculty contact hour for full-time faculty with the actual data reported for

DISPLAY 6 Analysis of the Mean Salaries Paid by the Highest and Lowest Paying Community College Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1979 to Fall 1987

Item	Fall 1979	Fall 1981	Fall 1983	Fall 1985	Fall 1986	Fall 1987
Mean Salaries:						
Ten Highest Paying Districts						
Weighted[1]	$27,874	$33,213	$35,748	$40,059	$42,144	$44,137
Unweighted	27,853	33,341	36,059	39,946	42,001	44,207
Ten Lowest Paying Districts						
Weighted[1]	$22,993	$26,675	$28,563	$31,547	$32,515	$34,454
Unweighted	23,152	26,563	28,645	31,619	32,422	34,600
Percent Higher Paying Districts Exceed Lower Paying Districts (Weighted Means):	21.2%	24.5%	25.2%	27.0%	29.6%	28.1%
Systemwide Mean Salary (69 Districts)[1]	$26,270	$30,156	$32,704	$36,203	$38,005	$40,046
Number of Regular Faculty:						
Ten Highest Paying Districts	3,568	3,354	2,572	2,044	2,182	2,022
Ten Lowest Paying Districts	1,218	2,595	1,891	974	1,341	1,205
Percent Higher Paying Districts Exceed Lower Paying Districts (Total Faculty)	192.9%	29.2%	36.0%	109.9%	62.7%	69.6%

1. Weighted by total full-time faculty in each reporting district.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

part-time and overload faculty. Also on a systemwide basis, these comparisons show full-time faculty in 1987-88 earning just about twice as much per weekly faculty contact hour as part-time faculty, and 70.4 percent more than the amount paid for overload assignments.

Summary

In the current year, regular and contract faculty were reported to be earning an average salary of $40,046, an amount that is probably understated by 2 to 3 percent, since 27 districts reported complete data in time for inclusion in the Chancellor's Office report. Twenty-six other districts reported the percentage amount of the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) but could not include the increase in their mean salary figures. Fifteen districts were still in the process of negotiating current-year increases and thus could not report a cost-of-living adjustment figure. Of the two remaining districts, Lassen reported that figure but no other information, while Victor Valley reported no information whatsoever. Most of the 16 districts reporting no cost-of-living adjustment are likely to approve some increase in salary for all faculty. For the 52 districts that did report cost-of-living adjustment data, the average increase for 1987-88 was about 5.0 percent, once off-schedule adjustments are included. This compares to a comparable figure of about 5.5 percent in 1986-

DISPLAY 7 Annualized Cost of Living Adjustments Granted to Regular and Contract California Community College Faculty, By District, 1985-86 to 1987-88

District	Number of Full-Time Faculty 1987-88	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1985-86	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1986-87	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1987-88
Allan Hancock	93	3.00%	6.00%	5.50%
Antelope Valley	80	7.00	4.30	*
Barstow	21	2.00	5.50	*
Butte	104	6.04	5.82	6.65
Cabrillo	155	4.50	4.00	4.00
Cerritos	213	6.00	5.77	5.20
Chaffey	148	3.14	3.14	6.00
Citrus	100	6.00	5.50	4.50
Coachella Valley	94	0.00	5.00	5.50
Coast	486	6.00	0.00	2.00
Compton	68	*	6.50	7.00
Contra Costa	368	6.20	5.00	*
El Camino	276	5.25	5.00	5.00
Foothill	322	7.00	6.50	5.00
Fremont-Newark	96	4.99	6.00	4.00
Gavilan	52	10.00	6.50	5.25
Glendale	147	5.50	5.00	3.00
Grossmont	201	7.00	6.00	*
Hartnell	80	5.50	6.00	1.80
Imperial	69	3.00	0.00	6.00
Kern	267	3.00	2.00	3.42
Lake Tahoe	15	6.00	0.00	7.00
Lassen	N/A	0.00	0.00	6.60
Long Beach	232	12.60	6.50	4.00
Los Angeles	1,628	0.00	0.00	7.00
Los Rios	568	7.91	1.34	6.96
Marin	131	0.00	15.10	3.50
Mendocino	32	5.50	5.70	2.85
Merced	85	4.79	4.00	6.00
MiraCosta	68	5.50	5.50	5.50
Monterey Peninsula	96	5.70	6.65	5.00
Mt. San Antonio	244	5.00	5.00	4.25
Mt. San Jacinto	39	3.47	6.02	6.26
Napa	86	2.00	2.13	2.00
North Orange	435	6.80	7.00	*
Palo Verde	12	6.00	3.50	4.50
Palomar	222	6.00	6.44	5.00
Pasadena Area	285	5.00	6.00	*
Peralta	344	5.00	7.00	*

(continued)

DISPLAY 7, continued

District	Number of Full-Time Faculty 1987-88	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1985-86	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1986-87	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1987-88
Rancho Santiago	259	3.50%	6.01%	4.28%
Redwoods	81	4.40	5.30	4.80
Rio Hondo	156	6.20	5.00	3.40
Riverside	151	6.50	6.50	4.00
Saddleback	211	1.75	4.00	4.26
San Bernardino	171	8.00	8.00	*
San Diego	368	5.00	6.00	*
San Diego Adult	87	5.00	*	*
San Francisco Centers	238	5.00	6.50	*
San Francisco	351	5.00	6.50	*
San Joaquin Delta	201	7.50	6.45	5.50
San Jose	205	5.00	5.00	4.75
San Luis Obispo	70	4.52	4.59	6.19
San Mateo	348	5.00	4.00	5.00
Santa Barbara	156	8.00	9.00	3.40
Santa Clarita	48	6.00	7.00	5.00
Santa Monica	190	6.00	5.00	6.00
Sequoias	131	5.00	4.50	5.20
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	107	4.00	8.00	3.00
Sierra	111	8.00	6.14	4.00
Siskiyou	43	5.00	5.00	*
Solano County	120	8.06	6.00	3.00
Sonoma County	220	7.50	4.00	5.25
South County	204	5.00	5.50	2.00
Southwestern	159	5.00	8.00	7.00
State Center	263	6.00	5.00	*
Ventura County	322	6.00	4.00	*
Victor Valley	N/A	4.25	*	*
West Hills	41	5.00	5.00	5.20
West Kern	17	5.00	5.06	*
West Valley	242	10.20	5.00	6.00
Yosemite	149	5.00	8.00	*
Yuba	99	6.32	3.10	6.00
Number of Districts Reporting	--	69	68	54
Total/Mean -- Excluding San Diego Evening and San Francisco Centers	13,156[1]	5.06%	4.58%	5.04%
Total/Mean -- Including San Diego Evening and San Francisco Centers	13,481[1]	5.06%	4.54%	5.04%

1. Lassen and Victor Valley Community College Districts did not report data to the Chancellor's Office in time for this report.

* District was still in salary negotiations at the time of the Chancellor's Office deadline for submitting data.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

DISPLAY 8 Sonoma County Junior College District Faculty Salary Schedule, 1987-88

Step	Class I BA	Class II BA + 30	Class III MA	Class IV MA +20 or BA +55 with MA	Class V MA +40 or BA +75 with MA	Class VI Doctorate
1	$23,321	$23,758	$25,069	$27,348	$29,6[illegible]	$30,526
2	24,524	24,988	26,381	28,722	31,[illegible]	31,962
3	25,727	26,219	27,693	30,096	32,498	33,398
4	26,930	27,449	29,005	31,469	33,934	34,834
5	28,133	28,679	30,317	32,843	35,370	36,270
6	29,336	29,910	31,629	34,217	36,806	37,706
7	30,540	31,140	32,941	35,591	38,242	39,142
8	31,743	32,370	34,253	36,965	39,678	40,478
9	32,946	33,601	35,565	38,339	41,113	42,013
10	34,149	34,831	36,877	39,713	42,549	43,449
11			38,189	41,087	43,985	44,885
12			39,501	42,461	45,421	46,321
16	Professional Growth*		40,501	43,461	46,421	47,321
20	Professional Growth*			44,461	47,421	48,321
24	Professional Growth*				48,421	49,321

* Professional growth increments of $1,000 at:

1. The sixteenth step with ten years of service at Santa Rosa Junior College and 15 approved growth units earned after Step 12 placement.
2. The twentieth step with a minimum of four years service and 15 additional approved growth units earned after Step 16 placement.
3. The twenty-fourth step with a minimum of four years service and 15 additional approved growth units earned after Step 20 placement.

Credits utilized to attain Professional Growth Increments MAY NOT be used for Class advancement.

Source: Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

87. Part-time faculty continue to be paid about half the amount paid to full-time faculty on a per-contact-hour basis, and the difference between them has increased slightly over the past six years. The number of part-time faculty employed has declined by 5.5 percent since 1981 -- from 26,513 to 25,056 -- but increased by 5.3 percent over its Fall 1986 level of 23,795. The relative shares of contact hours taught by full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and full-time faculty teaching overloads has not changed appreciably over the seven-year period surveyed in this report.

The lack of complete mean salary data continues to be a problem with the Chancellor's Office Staff Data File, one that is probably unsolvable given the length of many collective bargaining negotiations and the early spring deadline for the Chancellor's Office report. For this reason, the data appearing in this chapter should be viewed with caution.

Implications of the Community College data

A major challenge facing the California Community Colleges through the year 2000 will be the recruitment of a large number of Community College faculty required because of enrollment growth and to replace those who will leave the system through retirement or normal attrition (at present, the average

DISPLAY 9 Analysis of the Mean Dollars per Weekly Faculty Contact Hour (WFCH) Paid to Full-Time Faculty, Part-Time Faculty, and Full-Time Faculty Teaching Overload Assignments in the California Community Colleges, Fall 1981 to Fall 1987

Item	Fall 1981	Fall 1982	Fall 1983	Fall 1984	Fall 1985	Fall 1986	Fall 1987
1. Number							
Full-Time Faculty[1]	9,716	9,160	9,871	9,121	9,161	8,981	8,686
Part-Time Faculty	26,513	24,115	21,924	22,810	23,790	23,795	25,056
Overload Faculty	5,664	5,514	5,225	5,370	5,276	5,101	5,349
2. Total WFCH Taught							
Full-Time Faculty	220,695	229,958	200,674	211,130	209,608	211,769	205,379
Part-Time Faculty	140,338	125,923	116,749	122,063	127,570	129,659	133,459
Overload Faculty	26,558	25,402	24,088	24,620	24,180	23,764	24,951
3. Percentage Distribution of WFCH Taught							
Full-Time Faculty	56.9%	60.3%	58.8%	59.0%	58.0%	58.0%	59.3%
Part-Time Faculty	36.2	33.0	34.2	34.1	35.3	35.5	34.3
Overload Faculty	6.9	6.7	7.1	6.9	6.7	6.5	6.4
4. Mean WFCH Taught							
Full-Time Faculty[2]	14.3	15.7	13.3	14.6	14.5	15.0	15.0
Part-Time Faculty	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.4	5.8	5.4	5.3
Overload Faculty	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7
5. Mean Dollars Paid per WFCH							
Part-Time Faculty	$20.50	$21.74	$22.41	$23.20	$24.32	$25.50	$26.77
Overload Faculty	22.65	25.69	26.09	27.19	28.80	30.34	31.36
6. Compensation of Overload Faculty as a Percentage of Part -Time Faculty	110.5%	118.2%	116.4%	117.2%	118.4%	119.0%	117.1%
7. Mean Dollars Paid to Contract and Regular Faculty per WFCH, Assuming No Overload Assignments[3]							
Unadjusted	$53.52	$56.55	$58.01	$59.99	$63.85	$67.01	$71.25
Adjusted[4]	40.14	42.41	43.51	44.99	47.89	50.26	53.44
8. Compensation of Full-Time Faculty (Adjusted in Item 7) as a Percentage of Part-Time and Overload Faculty per WFCH							
Part-Time Faculty	195.8%	195.1%	194.2%	193.9%	196.9%	197.1%	199.6%
Overload Faculty	177.2	165.1	166.8	165.5	166.3	165.6	170.4

1. No overload.
2. Full-time faculty teaching regular assignments only.
3. Based on a 35-week year.
4. Dollar amount reduced by 25 percent to reflect additional responsibilities of regular and contract faculty such as counseling, advising, committee work, office hours, and community service.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

age of full-time Community College faculty members is about 48 years). The number of part-time faculty members, and their proper role in Community College staffing, will also represent a key issue of faculty quality during this time.

The data on Community College faculty compensation presented in this section of the report suggest several implications for the future:

- One is the disparity in salaries between districts, and the implications of these disparities in current and future quality. These differences, like many others related to local control in a statewide financing system, create tensions that the current funding system fails to address.

- The use of part-time faculty is a second issue of concern. Although the number of these faculty has decreased from its peak in 1981, they continue to represent a major part of campus teaching loads.

Colleges make temporary faculty appointments for a variety of reasons, usually to fill definable needs within a department, such as the replacement of regular faculty who have other assignments either on or off campus, replacement of retired faculty, the institution's inability to fill full-time positions because of the lack of qualified applicants, special assignments to teach remedial or basic courses, the unavailability of tenured or on-tract positions, and the need for special or unique expertise. In addition, today's Community College students are older, more frequently part time, and often employed full time. Many institutions have responded to these students by developing extensive evening class schedules and hiring part-time faculty to teach them.

There is general agreement that Community Colleges need temporary faculty in order to respond to these staffing challenges and to provide certain courses that require special expertise. Yet Community College administrators have become increasingly dependent upon the use of part-time faculty not only to meet the special needs of students but also as a means of balancing their budgets. The well-known "freeway flyer" -- the part-time faculty person who often commutes dozens of miles between campuses or even districts -- receives no fringe benefits and is compensated with only half the salary of full-time faculty members.

Temporary appointments may be justified by budget limitations, but the overuse of part-time faculty may be detrimental to quality and is not desirable. If faculty who retire are replaced by part-time faculty to save costs, the result may be a reduction of tenured faculty that in turn will have a consequent impact on the curricular responsibilities for the remaining tenured faculty, since part-time faculty are not normally required to carry out those responsibilities.

To ensure that the use of part-time faculty does not undermine instructional quality, their compensation should be improved to make such careers as attractive as those of full-time faculty. The implications of such compensation of these part-time faculty, and the adequacy of current State policies regarding the use of part-time faculty in all three public segments warrant further study.

3 *Selected Administrators' Salaries in Universities*

Introduction

During the 1981 Legislative Session, the Budget Conference Committee adopted the following Supplemental Language to the Budget Bill:

> It is the intent of the Legislature that the California Postsecondary Education Commission include in its annual report on faculty salaries and fringe benefits comparative information on salaries of administrators within the University of California and the California State University.

Since 1981-82, the University and the State University have collected data from their comparison institutions and forwarded them to the Commission for analysis. The Commission has then included them in its report, together with additional data from the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA). In this way, it has become possible to present a comparison between California's public institutions and those in the rest of the nation for a representative sample of administrative positions.

For several years, there was a lack of consensus as to which positions should be surveyed, which comparisons were valid, and which comparison institutions should be surveyed. Initially in 1981-82, a list of 25 administrative titles was selected from the list of 130 position descriptions developed by CUPA, a number that was reduced to as few as 15 in 1983-84. In 1986, the Advisory Committee on the Faculty Salary Methodology discussed the issue of administrators' salaries and compiled a list that should remain constant for the foreseeable future. That list includes 18 campus-based positions at both the University of California and the California State University, plus 12 and 10 positions from the respective central offices. It was also agreed that the same group of comparison institutions used for faculty analyses should be used for administrators, but only for the campus-based positions. Central office salaries are to be reported, but without reference to other systems across the country.

University of California

Display 10 on page 18 shows the data submitted by the University of California and its comparison institutions for campus-based positions in 1987-88. Central office administrative positions are shown in Display 12 on page 20.

Last year's report showed that the University exceeded comparison institution salaries in six positions and lagged behind comparison institution salaries in 11. This year, however, because of changes in the University's group of comparison institutions, and because of the data reported by those institutions, the University now trails its comparison group in all 18-position categories.

Several factors account for this difference. For example, last year six comparison institutions reported data for the position of director of information systems; this year only three comparison institutions reported such data, and at a substantially higher average, thereby causing the University to lag that small comparison group by 35.4 percent. Another example explaining the University's marked lag in salary compensation is that last year it reported salary data for the directors of athletics at only two campuses, while this year it reported data for five campuses, which in turn had the net effect of lowering the University's overall average.

Display 10, therefore, shows that University of California campus-based administrators are paid between 0.9 and 35.4 percent less than their comparison institution counterparts in all 18 position categories surveyed. Chancellors at the University are paid on the average 12.8 percent less than their comparison institution counterparts.

The California State University

The California State University also surveyed 18 campus-based positions, as shown in Display 11 on page 19, with ten central office administrators' sala-

DISPLAY 10 *Salaries of Campus-Based Administrators at the University of California and Its Eight Comparison Universities, 1987-88*

Administrative Title	University of California Average	Comparison Institution Average	University Lags Comparison Group by:
Chief Executive Officer, Single Institution	$125,889	$141,964	-12.8%
Chief Academic Officer	107,713	122,430	-13.7
Chief Business Officer	99,391	113,727	-14.4
Director, Personnel/Human Resources	76,400	77,100	-0.9
Chief Budgeting Officer	80,025	87,750	-9.7
Director, Library Services	82,489	95,068	-15.3
Director, Computer Center	72,900	88,506	-21.4
Chief, Physical Plant	75,463	82,951	-9.9
Director, Campus Security	62,163	63,318	-1.9
Director, Information Systems	78,557	106,372	-35.4
Director, Student Financial Aid	59,177	62,701	-6.0
Director, Athletics	77,279	93,902	-21.5
Dean of Agriculture	100,933	110,000	-9.0
Dean of Arts and Sciences	96,067	107,352	-11.8
Dean of Business	94,140	123,217	-30.9
Dean of Education	93,450	95,843	-2.6
Dean of Engineering	104,150	119,399	-14.6
Dean of Graduate Programs	94,278	96,978	-2.9

Note: Comparison institutions include Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard University, Stanford University, University of Illinois (Urbana), University of Michigan (Ann Arbor), University of Virginia, and the State University of New York (Buffalo).

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

ries shown in Display 12. For the campus-based positions, the State University pays between 2.4 and 19.5 percent more for five position titles, and between 0.4 and 18.1 percent less for 13 position titles. The State University consistently pays substantially more than its comparison universities to its directors of campus security, its directors of institutional research, and its directors of student financial aid, and consistently less to all of its deans. In the dean category, the greatest divergence is for deans of business (18.1 percent below the comparison group), with the least lag for deans of graduate programs (3.4 percent less). State University campus presidents ($101,522) are currently paid 16.2 percent less than their comparison institution counterparts. It should be noted, however, that salary rate and range figures for central-office administrators are as of March 1988, and that campus administrative salary data is an average of Fall 1987 and Fall 1988 salaries.

*DISPLAY 11 Administrative Salary Data for the California State University and Its Twenty Comparison Universities, 1987-88**

Administrative Title	Number of California State University Campuses	California State University Average	Number of Comparison Institutions	Comparison Institution Average	State University Exceeds or (Lags) Comparison Group by:
Chief Executive Officer, Single Institution (President)	19	$101,522	16	$117,947	(16.2%)
Chief Academic Officer	19	84,617	15	95,557	(12.9)
Chief Business Officer	12	80,769	16	85,756	(6.2)
Director, Personnel/ Human Resources	18	57,040	13	59,484	(4.3)
Chief Budgeting Officer	18	46,988	13	52,405	(11.5)
Director of Libraries	19	66,522	16	66,815	(0.4)
Director of Computer Center	11	62,983	10	61,474	2.4
Director of Physical Plant	15	56,502	14	58,627	(3.8)
Director of Campus Security	18	54,656	16	43,973	19.5
Director of Institutional Research	13	61,524	13	52,611	14.5
Director of Student Financial Aid	18	53,632	16	46,336	13.6
Director, Athletics	17	65,972	13	63,088	4.4
Dean of Agriculture	4	74,697	4	77,501	(3.8)
Dean of Arts and Sciences	15	71,277	15	80,621	(13.1)
Dean of Business	19	72,287	13	85,345	(18.1)
Dean of Education	14	69,319	13	76,635	(10.6)
Dean of Engineering	11	78,830	14	86,516	(9.8)
Dean of Graduate Programs	9	70,621	15	73,010	(3.4)

* The data for campus administrative positions shown are an average of Fall 1987 and Spring 1988 salaries.

Note: Comparison institutions include Arizona State University, University of Bridgeport, Bucknell University (Pa.), Cleveland State University, University of Colorado (Denver), Georgia State University, Loyola University (Chicago), Mankato State University, University of Maryland (Baltimore), University of Nevada (Reno), North Carolina State University, Reed College, Rutgers University (Newark), State University of New York (Albany), University of Southern California, University of Texas (Arlington), Tufts University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Wayne State University, and University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee).

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

*DISPLAY 12 Salaries of Central-Office Administrators at the University of California and the California State University, 1987-88**

Administrative Title and Number of Positions	University of California	Range of Increase Over 1986-87	Administrative Title and Number of Positions	The California State University**	Increase Over 1986-87
President (1)	$198,600	5.0%	Chancellor (1)	$128,530	6.0%
Senior Vice Presidents (2)	129,000	9.5*	Executive Vice Chancellor (1)	112,238	N/A
Vice Presidents (3)	112,400 to 115,800	9.5*	Vice Chancellors (4)	105,640 to 110,656	6.0
Associate Vice Presidents (3)	90,300 to 103,600	6.0 to 6.8	Deputy Vice Chancellor (1)	88,620	N/A
Assistant Vice-Presidents (11)	76,100 to 102,000	4.8 to 6.0	Assistant Vice Chancellors (10)	71,724 to 88,776	7.0 to 8.9
Director of State Governmental Relations (1)	85,300	6.0	Director of Governmental Affairs (1)	94,476	5.0
University Auditor (1)	77,800	6.6	University Auditor (1)	92,040	6.5
General Counsel (1)	132,300	10.0*			
Treasurer (1)	152,100	10.0*	General Counsel (1)	110,656	6.0
Associate Treasurer (1)	126,200	9.0			
Secretary to the Regents (1)	91,300	5.0	Associate General Counsel (1)	86,040	6.1

* Includes 1/1/88 equity increase.

** Salary rates and ranges for the California State University's systemwide positions are as of Spring 1988.

Source: University of California, Office of the President; and the California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

Appendix

August 9, 1979

Gerald Hayward
Director of Legislative and Public Affairs
California Community Colleges
1238 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Jerry:

As you know, the Legislature took several actions during the current session concerning the reporting of salary data. The first of these emanated from the Legislative Analyst's report and requires the Commission to include the Community Colleges in our annual reports on University of California and California State University and Colleges faculty salaries. The second action appropriated $15,000 to the Chancellor's Office for the purpose of collecting salary data for the 1978-79 and 1979-80 fiscal years. The latter action, however, did not specify the type of information to be collected.

It is my understanding that you discussed this subject with Bill Storey and agreed that we should develop a detailed list of the information we will require for our report. After that, I presume you will contact us if there are any questions or ambiguities.

Our questions fall into three categories: (1) full-time faculty, (2) part-time faculty, and (3) administrators. For each of these, we will need the following:

Full-time faculty

1. A listing of all salary classifications (e.g. BA + 30, MA, etc.) for each Community College District.
2. The actual salary at each step of each classification.
3. The number of faculty at each step of each classification.
4. The amounts of any bonuses that are granted to faculty, the number of faculty receiving them, the total salary of every faculty member receiving a bonus, and the reason for granting the bonus.
5. The percentage increase in salary granted (i.e. the range adjustment) for the fiscal year covered by the report.
6. The total number of full-time faculty in each district.
7. The mean salary received by those full-time faculty.
8. The total dollar amount paid to full-time faculty as a group.

Part-time faculty

1. The total number of part-time faculty employed by each district on both a headcount and full-time-equivalent (FTE) basis.
2. The mean salary paid to each headcount faculty member in each district.
3. The mean salary paid to each FTE faculty member in each district.

4. The total dollar amount paid to all part-time faculty in each district.
5. A summary of the compensation plan for part-time faculty members in each district.

Administrators

1. A list of all administrative positions (titles) in each district.
2. The salary schedule for each position.
3. The number of headcount and FTE employees occupying each administrative position.
4. The actual salary paid to each employee in each administrative position.
5. The percentage increase in salary granted (i.e. the range adjustment) for the fiscal year covered by the report.

A few words of explanation may be in order. The data requested for full-time faculty are very similar to those that have been collected by the Chancellor's Office for a number of years but which were not collected for 1978-79 due to Proposition 13 reductions. The only major difference relates to the detail on bonuses that was not clearly presented in prior reports.

We are asking for data on part-time faculty because of objections raised by Community College representatives. At the time our preliminary report on Community College salaries was presented, many Community College representatives, including those from the Chancellor's Office, complained that the data were misleading because part-time faculty were not included. To avoid that difficulty in the future, it is imperative that data on these faculty be included in next year's report to the Legislature.

We are also asking for data on administrators because of the concerns expressed by both the Legislature (on the subject of academic administration generally) and various Community College faculty organizations. I am not sure we will publish any of the data on administrators but we do want to be able to respond to questions should they arise.

The final item concerns the dates for receipt of the data. As you know, we publish two salary reports each year. Since the University and the State University report to us each year by November 1, we think it would be appropriate to set November 1 as a reporting date (for the 1978-79 data) for the Chancellor's Office as well. For the 1979-80 data, we would like to have a report by March 1 so that we may include it in our final report to the Legislature. In future years, the March 1 date should become permanent.

If you have any questions concerning any of these matters, please let me know

Sincerely,

Kenneth B. O'Brien, Jr.
Associate Director

KBOB:mc

28

References

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Faculty Salaries in California Public Higher Education, 1979-80*. Commission Report 79-6. Sacramento: The Commission, April 1979.

--. *Methods for Calculating Salary and Fringe Benefit Cost Comparisons, 1985-86 to 1994-95: A Revision of the Commission's 1977 Methodology for Preparing Its Annual Reports on Faculty and Administrative Salaries and Fringe Benefit Costs*. Commission Report 85-11. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1985.

--. *Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1986-87: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation*. Commission Report 87-36. Sacramento: The Commission, September 1987.

--. *Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1988-89: The Commission's 1987 Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51*. Commission Report 88-9. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1988.

Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges. *Study of Part-Time Instruction*. Sacramento: Research Analysis Unit, Chancellor's Office, January 1987.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of December 1988, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Mim Andelson, Los Angeles
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach, *Chairperson*
Henry Der, San Francisco
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco
Helen Z. Hansen, Long Beach
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles, *Vice Chairperson*
Sharon N. Skog, Palo Alto
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; appointed by the Regents of the University of California

Claudia H. Hampton, Los Angeles; appointed by the Trustees of the California State University

Borgny Baird, Long Beach; appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; appointed by the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Kenneth L. Peters, Tarzana; appointed by the California State Board of Education

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obispo; appointed by California's independent colleges and universities

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including Community Colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other State agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning.

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to address the Commission may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of a meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its interim executive director, Kenneth B. O'Brien, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 40 to 50 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514; telephone (916) 445-7933.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON ACADEMIC SALARIES, 1987-88

California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 88-30

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Other recent reports of the Commission include:

88-15 Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics Fall 1987: University of California, The California State University, and California's Independant Colleges and Universities (March 1988)

88-16 Legislative Update, March 1988: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1988)

88-17 State Policy for Faculty Development in California Public Higher Education: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1986 Budget Act (May 1988)

88-18 to 20 Exploring Faculty Development in California Higher Education: Prepared forthe California Postsecondary Education Commission by Berman, Weiler Associates:

88-18 Volume One: Executive Summary and Conclusions, by Paul Berman and Daniel Weiler, December 1987 (March 1988)

88-19 Volume Two: Findings, by Paul Berman, Jo Ann Intili and Daniel Weiler, December 1987 (March 1988)

88-20 Volume Three: Appendix, by Paul Berman, Jo Ann Intili and Daniel Weiler, January 1988 (March 1988)

88-21 Staff Development in California's Public Schools: Recommendations of the Policy Development Committee for the California Staff Development Policy Study, March 16, 1988 (March 1988)

88-22 and 23 Staff Development in California: Public and Personal Investments, Program Patterns, and Policy Choices, by Judith Warren Little, William H. Gerritz, David S. Stern, James W. Guthrie, Michael W. Kirst, and David D. Marsh. A Joint Publication of Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development • Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), December 1987:

88-22 Executive Summary (March 1988)

88-23 Report (March 1988)

88-24 Status Report on Human Corps Activities: The First in a Series of Five Annual Reports to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 1820 (Chapter 1245, Statutes of 1987) (May 1988)

88-25 Proposed Construction of the Petaluma Center of Santa Rosa Junior College: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to a Request for Capital Funds for Permanent Off-Campus Center in Southern Sonoma County (May 1988)

88-26 California College-Going Rates, 1987 Update: The Eleventh in a Series of Reports on New Freshman Enrollments at California's Colleges and Universities by Recent Graduates of California High Schools (June 1988)

88-27 Proposed Construction of Off-Campus Community College Centers in Western Riverside County:. A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to a Request of the Riverside and Mt. San Jacinto Community College Districts for Capital Funds to Build Permanent Off-Campus Centers in Norco and Moreno Valley and South of Sun City (June 1988)

88-28 Annual Report on Program Review Activities, 1986-87: The Twelfth in a Series of Reports to the Legislature and the Governor on Program Review by Commission Staff and California's Public Colleges and Universities (June 1988)

88-29 Diversification of the Faculty and Staff in California Public Postsecondary Education from 1977 to 1987: The Fifth in the Commission's Series of Biennial Reports on Equal Employment Opportunity in California's Public Colleges and Universities (September 1988)

88-30 Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1987-88: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation (September 1988)

88-31 The Role of the California Postsecondary Education Commission in Achieving Educational Equity in California: The Report of the Commission's Special Committee on Educational Equity, Cruz Reynoso, *Chair* (September 1988)

88-32 A Comprehensive Student Information System, by John G. Harrison: A Report Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission by the Wyndgate Group, Ltd. (September 1988)

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
FEB 03 1989